

Remarks

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 23, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 23, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-9, 11-18, 26-31, and 33 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-9, 11-18, 26-31, and 33 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1-9, 11-18, 26-31, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph on the grounds that the entire range of pH is not enabled because, the Examiner alleges, even a 3.0% solution of ethylenediamine without acid would have a pH below 12. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 12, and 26 each require a cleaning composition comprising about 0.1 to about 3.0 wt.% ethylenediamine, an acid in an amount such that the composition has a pH of about 5.0 to about 12.0, and deionized water. It is important to note that the ethylenediamine is not claimed to be a solution comprising about 0.1 to about 3.0 wt% of ethylenediamine within the cleaning solution, but rather, the cleaning solution composition comprises about 0.1 to about 3.0 wt% ethylenediamine. As shown in the attachment, "Electrochemistry of Copper in Aqueous Ethylenediamine Solutions" to *Aksu et al.*, ethylenediamine has a pH of up to 14 (see Figure 1). The reference referred to by the Examiner has a solution comprising 25% ethylenediamine. In other words, the reference referred to by the Examiner has diluted ethylenediamine, which inherently would have a lower pH than undiluted ethylenediamine. Thus, undiluted ethylenediamine does in fact have a pH greater than 12 as shown in the attached reference. Therefore, when about 0.1 to about 3.0 wt% ethylenediamine, deionized water, and an acid are together in a solution as currently claimed in claims 1, 12, and 26, it is respectfully submitted that a pH range of about 5.0 to about 12.0 is enabled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has requested information regarding the declaration of the present invention which names Fred Redeker as an inventor and the declaration submitted

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 which lists Fritz Redeker as an inventor. Applicants respectfully submit that Fred Redeker listed in the declaration and Fritz Redeker listed in the declaration submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 are the same person. Mr. Redeker no longer works for the assignee and has assigned all of his rights to any patent that may issue from the present application to the assignee. Because Mr. Redeker is no longer employed by the assignee, Mr. Redeker is no longer informed about the prosecution of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be appropriate to contact Mr. Redeker at this time as he is no longer employed by the assignee. Regarding the declaration submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, the declaration was a copy of the invention alert from which the present application was drafted. Mr. Redeker incorrectly listed his name as "Fritz Redeker", his nickname, rather than his official name, on the invention alert. Therefore, "Fritz Redeker" of the declaration submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 and "Fred Redeker" on the declaration of the patent application are the same person.

Additionally, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed July 18, 2003, but after going through our records, we realize that we have not yet received an initialed copy of the IDS indicating that the Examiner has considered the references. A courtesy copy of the IDS, including filing receipt, as well as courtesy copies of the references are included with this submission. Applicants respectfully request that the references be considered and an initialed copy of the IDS be mailed with the next communication from the USPTO.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for the Applicants

(w/attachments)